

EXHIBIT A

**UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

	X
In re:	:
LEHMAN BROTHERS HOLDINGS INC., <i>et al.</i> ,	:
Debtors.	:
	X
LEHMAN BROTHERS SPECIAL FINANCING INC.,	:
Plaintiff,	:
-against-	:
BANK OF AMERICA NATIONAL ASSOCIATION, <i>et al.</i> ,	:
Defendants.	:
	X

**ORDER CONCERNING SHIELD SECURITIES LIMITED'S
MOTION TO DISMISS FOR LACK OF PERSONAL JURISDICTION**

WHEREAS, on September 14, 2010, Lehman Brothers Special Financing Inc. ("LBSF") commenced the above-captioned action by filing a complaint naming Shield Securities Limited ("Shield") as a defendant [Dkt. No. 1];

WHEREAS, on September 15, 2014, LBSF filed the Third Amended Complaint ("Complaint") [Dkt. No. 831], in which Shield continued to be named as a defendant;

WHEREAS, the Court granted Shield Securities Limited's ("Shield") application to file a motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction in an Order dated October 6, 2014 [Dkt. No. 837];

WHEREAS, on October 15, 2014, Shield filed its Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Personal Jurisdiction [Dkt. No. 845] (the "Motion");

WHEREAS, on March 6, 2015, Lehman Brothers Special Financing Inc. (“LBSF”) filed its opposition to the Motion [Dkt. No. 1057];

WHEREAS, on March 27, 2015, Shield filed its reply to LBSF’s opposition to the Motion [Dkt. No. 1065];

WHEREAS, on May 7, 2015, LBSF filed a motion seeking leave to file a sur-reply, which attached its proposed sur-reply [Dkt. No. 1097];

WHEREAS, on May 8, 2015, Shield filed an opposition to LBSF’s motion for leave to file a sur-reply [Dkt. No. 1099];

WHEREAS, Shield and LBSF appeared for oral argument before the Court on May 8, 2015;

WHEREAS, Shield and LBSF exchanged further letters to the Court [Dkt. Nos. 1107, 1114, 1122];

WHEREAS, after considering the above-referenced papers and hearing the arguments of counsel at the hearing held on May 8, 2015, for the reasons set forth in Memorandum Decision issued by this Court on August 24, 2015 [Dkt. No. 1135],

It is hereby ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED THAT:

1. LBSF’s motion seeking leave to file a sur-reply is denied.
2. The Motion is granted and the Complaint is dismissed as against Shield.
3. The Court has *in rem* jurisdiction over LBSF’s property pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1334 and 11 U.S.C. § 541, including LBSF’s property interest in the Ruby Transaction, which is composed of LBSF’s security interest in the collateral underlying the Ruby Transaction and

LBSF's rights under the Transaction Documents,¹ and to the extent that Shield's Motion contested that jurisdiction, it is denied. The Court shall exercise such *in rem* jurisdiction.

Dated: September 28, 2015
New York, New York

/S/ Shelley C. Chapman
HONORABLE SHELLEY C. CHAPMAN
UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY JUDGE

¹ Capitalized terms used, but not defined herein, have the meaning assigned to them in Memorandum Decision issued by this court on August 24, 2015 [Dkt No. 1135].